REMARKS

The Examiner states that the arguments presented in the last response are not persuasive because applicant's range of ratios appear to be contradictory to the 3 to 30 weight percent range for the amount of bismaleimide. Applicant has amended claim 1 to add a limitation for weight percent, 3 to 30 weight % and amended the ratio range to be consistent with this weight percent range, that is 1:3 to 1:45. Support is found in the examples in the tables, and the ratios and weight percents are reported here as calculated from the data in the tables.

From Table 1:	Ratio	Wt% BMI
Example 1B	1:30	3.2
Example 1C	1:18	5.3
Example 1D	1: 9	10.6
Example 1E	1: 6	17
Example 1F	1: 3	30
Example 1G	1.1.8	55
From Table 3:		
Example 2B	1:45	2.1
Example 2C	1:9	11
Example 2D	1:3	31
Example 2E	1:1.8	55
From Table 5:		
Example 3B	1:27	3.6
Example 3C	1:8	12
Example 3D	1:2.7	36
Example 3E	1:1.6	59

In contrast to the invention as now claimed, Repecka's examples disclose the presence of particulate bismaleimides in weight percentages of 71.3% (Example 2), 37.5% (Example 4), 63,6% (Example 6), and 52% (Example 12) of the total formulation, and in weight ratios of solid resin to liquid resin of 1:0.7 to 1:1.5.

In view of the fact that Repecka teaches higher weight percentages of bismaleimide particulate resins and lower weight ratios of solid to liquid resin than applicant claims, Repecka gives no motivation for one skilled in the art to use the combination of weight percentages of solid resin below 30% and ratio of solid to liquid resin of greater than 1:3 to obtain the improvement in cohesive strength at elevated temperatures shown by applicant's formulations.

New claim 9 was added and further limits the weight percentage and ratio.

Applicant respectfully urges that the application is now in condition for allowance.

END OF REMARKS